

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims 1, 3, 8, 10, and 13 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 14-17 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-17 are pending and under consideration.

The rejections are traversed or obviated below and reconsideration of all pending claims in respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,487,081 issued to Homer et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Homer").

Applicant respectfully submits that Homer's carrier 300 combined with a hard disk drive so as to be easily detachable from a system is distinctly different from a hard disk drive adapter to solve the problem of size differences when installing a second hard disk drive which is smaller than a mounting receptacle into the mounting receptacle.

For example, Homer does not disclose teach or suggest at least, "hooks provided adjacent to respective corners of the supporting frame...and extension parts extending outward from the respective corners of the supporting frame and outside of the bottom part of the supporting frame to fit the hard disk drive adapter into the mounting receptacle," as recited in claim 8.

Page 2 of the Office Action asserts that Figure 1, and col. 4, lines 16-24 discloses, "extension parts extending outward from the respective corners of the supporting frame," as recited in claim 8. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that brace 310 corresponds to the "supporting frame" of claim 8 and that back portion 312 and inwardly-turned ends 320 correspond to "extension parts" of claim 8.

Accordingly, Homer discloses inwardly-turned ends 320, which turn inwardly toward the inside of the brace 310 and flat plate 352 (Figure 1). Therefore, the inwardly-turned ends 320 teach against "extension parts extending outward from the respective corners of the supporting frame and outside of the bottom part of the supporting frame to fit the hard disk drive adapter into the mounting receptacle," as recited in claim 8.

Page 3 of the Office Action also asserts that back portion 312 of Homer corresponds to a "widthwise sidewall" as recited in claim 10. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action can not assert that back portion 312 refers to both an "extension part" and a "widthwise sidewall"

because “an extension part” is different from a “widthwise sidewall” in the claims.

Accordingly, claim 8 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 8-10 patentably distinguish from the cited reference.

Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer.

As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that Homer’s carrier 300 combined with a hard disk drive so as to be easily detachable from a system is distinctly different from a hard disk drive adapter to solve the problem of size differences when installing a second hard disk drive which is smaller than a mounting receptacle into the mounting receptacle.

For example, Homer does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “hooks provided adjacent to respective corners of the supporting frame...and extension parts extended outward from the respective corners of the supporting frame...and the extension parts extended outside of the bottom part to fit the hard disk drive adapter into the mounting receptacle,” as recited in claim 1.

As discussed above, Homer discloses inwardly-turned ends 320, which turn inwardly toward the inside of the brace 310 and flat plate 352 (Figure 1). Therefore, the inwardly-turned ends 320 teach against “extension parts extended outward from the respective corners of the supporting frame... and the extension parts extended outside of the bottom part of the supporting frame to fit the hard disk drive adapter into the mounting receptacle,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claim 3 is amended to depend from claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, and 7 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 3, 4, and 7 patentably distinguish from the cited reference.

Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer in view of U.S. Patent 6,249,432 issued to Gamble et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Gamble").

Gamble does not cure the deficiencies of Homer. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Homer's carrier 300 or Gamble's carrier 15 combined with a hard disk drive so as to be easily detachable from a system is distinctly different from a hard disk drive adapter to solve the problem of size differences when installing a second hard disk drive which is smaller than a mounting receptacle into the mounting receptacle.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, for at least these reasons claim 5 patentably distinguish from the cited references.

Rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer in view of U.S. Patent 5,822,152 issued to Seaver et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Seaver").

Seaver does not cure the deficiencies of Homer. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Homer's carrier 300 or Seaver's carrier combined with a hard disk drive so as to be easily detachable from a system is distinctly different from a hard disk drive adapter to solve the problem of size differences when installing a second hard disk drive which is smaller than a mounting receptacle into the mounting receptacle.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, for at least these reasons claim 6 patentably distinguish from the cited references.

Rejection of Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Homer in view of U.S. Patent 5,886,869 issued to Fussell et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Fussell").

Fussell does not cure the deficiencies of Homer. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 8 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, for at least these reasons claims 11 and 12 patentably

distinguish from the cited references.

In addition, Homer and Fussell, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “the hard disk drive adapter having a supporting frame, hooks adjacent to respective corners of the supporting frame, and extension parts extending from the respective corners of the supporting frame having a bottom part, wherein the extension parts are extended outside of the bottom part,” as recited in claim 13.

As discussed above, Homer discloses inwardly-turned ends 320, which turn inwardly toward the inside of the brace 310 and flat plate 352 (Figure 1). Therefore, the inwardly-turned ends 320 teach against, “the extension parts are extended outside of the bottom part,” as recited in claim 13. In addition, Fussell does not cure the deficiencies of Homer. Accordingly, claim 13 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

#### Summary

Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/602,695

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 11, 2005

By: Paul F. Daebeler  
Paul F. Daebeler  
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501